

REMARKS

I. Status of the Application

Claims 1-4, 6-20, and 22 are all the claims in the application. By this Amendment, Applicant amends claim 10. No new subject matter has been entered.

II. Statement of Substance of Interview

Applicant gratefully acknowledges an interview granted by Supervisory Patent Examiner (SPE) Brian Pendleton and Examiner Nenna Ekpo, on February 17, 2011. During the interview, Applicant and Examiners discussed the rejections of the claims set forth in the Office Action dated June 24, 2010 based on the Amendment filed December 23, 2010, as follows.

Claims 1 and 16

Applicant submitted that Yamamoto does not teach retrieving the advertising information for a local area of the user based on the search command unless the search command is determined to include a designation of a geographic location and retrieving the advertising information from the data gateway for a designated geographic location if the received user search includes the designation of the geographic location, as claimed in claims 1 and 16.

Examiner Ekpo agreed and stated that claims 1 and 16 overcome the current rejection over the cited prior art.

Claims 9 and 19

Applicant submitted that Yamamoto does not disclose that the user's input is being received via same cable channel as the advertising is being transmitted, as recited in claims 9 and 19.

The Examiner agreed and stated that claims 9 and 19 overcome the current rejection over the cited prior art.

Claim 10

Applicant submitted that Yamamoto does not teach that the advertising information is received from an advertiser via an internet in an internet format and converted into a cable

network format or a satellite network format, for transmission over a cable network, as claimed in claim 10.

Examiner Ekpo stated she would need to reconsider these features of claim 10, based on the Remarks submitted in the Amendment filed December 23, 2010.

SPE Pendleton proposed amending claim 10 to further define the invention, as for example, specifying the format of the user input, similarly to what is recited in claims 9 and 19.

Accordingly, Applicant amends claim 10, as proposed by SPE Pendleton, and further addresses the rejection of claim 10 as follows below.

III. Rejection of Claims 10-11, 13-14, and 22 as being unpatentable over Miller and Yamamoto

Claim 10 *inter alia* recites: “the information demand is transmitted to the data gateway via the same digital broadcast channel as the advertising information is provided to the cable network headend.”

Yamamoto describes sending the transmission via satellite to a satellite 102. The satellite transmits the programming content to a local studio. The local studio inserts advertisements into the programming content. The content with the insertions is transmitted from the local studio via a satellite transmission transceiver 114 to a cable service provider which delivers the television signal over a cable network to subscribers. (col. 2, line 59 - col. 3, line 13.)

However, Yamamoto does not disclose details regarding the user input. In other words, Yamamoto describes providing the specific information via various networks and cable television, but is silent regarding format of the user input. That is, Yamamoto does not describe that the information demand (via the user’s input) is transmitted to the data gateway via the same digital broadcast channel as the advertising information is provided to the cable network headend.

Miller does not cure any above-discussed deficiency of Yamamoto.

It is respectfully submitted that neither Miller, nor Yamamoto, taken singularly or in combination, teaches or suggests at least “an interface unit configured to receive content information from an advertiser via an internet in an internet format; ... wherein the information

demand is transmitted to the data gateway via the same digital broadcast channel as the advertising information is provided to the cable network headend.”

It is, therefore, respectfully submitted that claim 10 and dependent claims 11-15 and 22 are patentable over the cited prior art.

Conclusion

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,
/ Marina V. Zalevsky /

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

23373

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Marina V. Zalevsky
Reg. no. 53,825

Date: February 25, 2011